



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HARVARD LAW REVIEW.

Published monthly, during the Academic Year, by Harvard Law Students.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$2.50 PER ANNUM. 35 CENTS PER NUMBER.

Editorial Board.

GORDON T. HUGHES, <i>Editor-in-Chief.</i>	FRANK L. HINCKLEY, <i>Treasurer.</i>
EDWARD B. ADAMS,	CHARLES P. HOWLAND,
HARVEY H. BAKER,	JAMES A. LOWELL,
JOHN A. BLANCHARD,	GEORGE RUBLEE,
ARTHUR H. BROOKS,	WILLIAM R. SEARS,
EDWARD B. BURLING,	JOHN S. SHEPPARD, JR.,
EDWARDS H. CHILDS,	JEREMIAH SMITH, JR.,
RICHARD W. HALE,	CHARLES WALCOTT,
AUGUSTUS N. HAND,	JOHN S. WOODRUFF.

THE LAW SCHOOL. — In the November number of the REVIEW a prediction was ventured that the total falling off in the attendance at the School this year would approximate 50, and a hope expressed that almost the whole of this diminution would prove to have taken place in the ranks of the special students. Fuller figures more than justify the forecast then made. The total loss is 43; the falling off in the class of special students is 48. There are 5 more men in the first-year class than in 1892-93. The second and third year classes added together give exactly the same total this year as last. The total registration this autumn as compared with that of the four preceding years is given below: —

	1889-90	1890-91	1891-92	1892-93	1893-94
Third year	50	44	48	69	66
Second year	59	73	112	119	122
First year	86	101	142	135	140
Specials	59	61	61	71	23
Total	254	279	363	394	351

Readers of the REVIEW may remember that there appeared in the December number of last year a table showing the make-up of four successive first-year classes, both geographically and as regards the holding of college degrees. It is thought advisable to publish a similar compilation this year, to serve as a record, not only of the growth of the School, but of the direction of its extension. The table follows: —

HARVARD GRADUATES.

Class of	From Massachusetts.	New England outside of Massachusetts.	Outside of New England.	Total.
1893	34	1	19	54
1894	30	2	17	49
1895	32	4	13	49
1896	23	7	17	47

GRADUATES OF OTHER COLLEGES.

Class of	From Massachusetts.	New England outside of Massachusetts.	Outside of New England.	Total.
1893	5	9	21	35
1894	7	20	38	65
1895	8	14	30	52
1896	14	11	45	70

HOLDING NO DEGREE.

Class of	From Mas- sachusetts.	New England outside of Massachusetts.	Outside of New England.	Total.	Total of Class.
1893	4	1	7	12	101
1894	20	1	10	31	142
1895	16	3	14	34	135
1896	10	4	9	23	140

The most noticeable thing about this table is the largely increased plurality of graduates from other colleges over graduates from Harvard. This is certainly matter for congratulation. As was pointed out last year, when the same tendency was observable, though in a far less degree, these figures plainly indicate that the School is enlarging its field. A further analysis by colleges makes the broadening of the influence of the School still more apparent. Yale sends 10 men this year, as against 7 last year, and 18 the year before. Amherst comes next, with 9 men. Six men come from Brown, 5 from Leland Stanford, and 3 each from Williams, Princeton, the University of Michigan, and Georgetown. Dartmouth, Bowdoin, Bates, Wesleyan, Boston, Alleghany, Iowa State University, and the University of Oregon each contribute 2 men. Over twenty other colleges send a man apiece.

AN unfortunate error in regard to the requirements for admission to the School seems to have gained general currency in the West. For example, the Michigan Law Journal for October asserts that "the announcement is made that Harvard College, commencing with the year 1895-96, will raise the qualification for admission to its Law School, so that none but students upon whom have been conferred the degree of A. B. or its equivalent, by first-class colleges, can enter the School." If the editors of the Michigan Law Journal and of the other periodicals which have repeated and enforced this statement had taken the trouble to glance at any of the circulars of the Law School, or at either the May or the October number of the REVIEW, they would have found this alleged "announcement" absolutely false, in general and in particular. The object of the rules to which this blundering reference is made has been stated so often that repetition seems mere tediousness. Those who think, with the Michigan Law Journal, that the "Harvard idea seems to be to exclude all but a privileged class from admission to the practice of the law," have only themselves to blame for their unfortunate misapprehension. Any man who passes a satisfactory examination in simple Latin and French and in Blackstone's Commentaries can enter the School, now as heretofore. All such students will be given the regular degree, after three years' residence and the passing of the requisite legal examinations, if they attain a mark within five per cent of that required for the honor degree; *i. e.*, if they attain what is often technically spoken of as "creditable standing." The Michigan Law Journal is of opinion that "Harvard's intentions are commendable enough, but

its method is too heroic. The tendency of its new rule is to bar from the study of the law, under the direction of experienced instructors, men of capacity and ability, and men who have not been so fortunate as to have enjoyed the luxury of that special collegiate education which entitles the student to the degree of A. B." Now, the "men of capacity and ability" referred to are precisely those who attain creditable standing in the School, and therefore become entitled to the degree. The rule excludes only men who have *neither* a liberal education, *nor* capacity and ability to attain "creditable standing." It does *not* "work injustice to those young men of brains and ambition whose circumstances have denied them a collegiate education and an A. B. degree, and who are infinitely better equipped mentally to enter upon the study of the law than a large percentage of the sons of aristocracy and wealth who have managed with mediocre ability and the aid of a tutor to squeeze themselves into the possession of an A. B. degree." The Chicago Legal News also is mistaken in its premises when it remarks that "Harvard may never have knocking at its classic doors the future Marshall, Webster, or Lincoln, because this mental giant has not in his pocket the A. B. degree." There is still room in Cambridge for all "mental giants," whether they come from the school or the plough. No "announcement" has been made that they are shut out, or that they will be shut out, either in 1895-96 or thereafter.

These misrepresentations of the position of the School are none the less hurtful because they are careless rather than intentional. It is hoped that the respectable periodicals which have given them color will be as prompt to correct as they were to spread them.

At the meeting of the American Bar Association this summer, two papers were read which should especially interest readers of the REVIEW. They are indorsements of the Harvard method of instruction by men from widely separated localities. The first of these is the address of Professor Austin Abbott, "Questions on Legal Education." In emphasizing the importance of a scientific study of procedure in schools, he refers to the work done along these lines by Professor Langdell, Professor Thayer, and Professor Ames. While premising that "there is no one best way of teaching law, any more than there is one best way of trying a case," he still seems to think that at least there is no better way than by the use of cases. But his description of his own manner of teaching makes it clear that the case system is an elastic one. Probably in no two schools is precisely the same method followed. Professor Abbott regards as one of the chief merits of the system the colloquy which is so marked a feature of the work at Harvard. The second address referred to is that of Emlin McClain, Professor of Law at the University of Iowa. Professor McClain, whose "Cases on Carriers" is used here, is an outspoken advocate of the case-system. However, he would confine it to the more elementary subjects; his point being that where information rather than discipline in legal thinking is the object sought, the use of cases is too slow and laborious. This is a suggestion certainly worthy of consideration.

THE Harvard Law School Association's prize for 1892 was taken by Oliver Reginald Mitchell, a graduate of last year, writing on "The Fictions of the Law: have they proved useful or detrimental to its Growth?" The essay will be published in an early number of the REVIEW.